

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/501,627	GUILLARME ET AL.	

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Hal I. Kaplan	2836	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** *Claims 30-36 allowed; claims 1, 4, 5, and 29 are rejected; claims 3, 6-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 are objected to.*

(1) Hal I. Kaplan.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Kristy J. Downing.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 30 May 2006

**Time:** 4:40 p.m.

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**BRIAN SIRCUS**

**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:  
Specification paragraph numbers referenced in amendment did not match the version submitted with preliminary amendment dated July 15, 2004. Applicant called the next day and confirmed that the published version of the specification (2005/0083715) is the correct version..